



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,082	03/31/2004	Edward K. Y. Jung	QQ1-0004US	9452
29150	7590	05/23/2008	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE STE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			HUYNH, NAM TRUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,082	Applicant(s) JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner NAM HUYNH	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 2/14/2008. Of the previously presented claims 1-26, no amendments were made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 9, 12-15, 20 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferri et al. (US 2005/0275532) (hereinafter Ferri).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Ferri teaches a method comprising: transmitting (distributing among the motes) at least a part of one or more mote -addressed content indexes (routing map) (paragraph 18).

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Ferri teaches transmitting at least a part of one or more mote-addressed content indexes further comprises: transmitting at least a part of at least one of a mote-addressed sensing index (functional capabilities) or a mote-addressed control index (paragraph 24).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, Ferri teaches transmitting at least a part of one or more mote-addressed content indexes further comprises: transmitting at least a part of a mote-addressed routing/spatial index (routing map) (paragraph 18).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Ferri teaches transmitting at least a part of one or more mote-addressed content indexes further comprises: effecting the transmitting with a reporting entity at a mote (remote transceiver) (paragraph 8).

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Ferri teaches transmitting at least a part of one or more mote-addressed content indexes further comprises: effecting the transmitting in response to a query (GATHER broadcast) (paragraph 28).

Regarding claim 23, the limitations are rejected as applied to claim 1. Ferri further teaches that the mote contains a remote (proximate) transceiver (paragraph 8).

Regarding claim 24, the limitations are rejected as applied to claims 1-4.

Regarding claim 25, Ferri teaches at least one reporting entity resident on the mote further comprises: a processor configured to transmit at least a part of said at least one mote-addressed content index (figure 1, item 26).

Regarding claim 26, Ferri teaches the mote comprises: at least one of a processor, a memory, or a communications device formed from a substrate (figure 2, item 26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 5-7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferri et al. (US 2005/0275532) (hereinafter Ferri) in view of Chin et al. (US 2004/0090326) (hereinafter Chin).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, Ferri teaches the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 12, but does not explicitly teach that the transmission of the mote-addressed content indexes are effected in response to a schedule. Chin discloses a wireless sensor network wherein the sensors communicate with one another pursuant to a pre-arranged or self-organized communication protocol and schedule (paragraph 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Ferri, to allow the motes to distribute information in response to a schedule, as taught by Chin, in order for the motes to assume a so-called sleep mode during intervening periods and conserve power.

Regarding claims 6 and 17, Chin teaches transmitting in response to a schedule further comprises: means for receiving the schedule (paragraph 16).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, Chin teaches transmitting in response to a schedule further comprises: means for deriving the schedule (paragraph 16).

6. Claims 10, 11, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferri et al. (US 2005/0275532) (hereinafter Ferri) in view of Herrmann et al. (US 2003/0151513) (hereinafter Herrmann).

Ferri teaches the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 12, but does not explicitly teach that the mote-addressed content indexes are transmitted utilizing at least one of a private or public key. Herrmann discloses a self-organizing wireless network wherein links between nodes are secured by encryption using for example public shared keys (paragraph 44). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Ferri, to allow the motes to utilize a public shared key, as taught by Herrmann, in order to prevent unauthorized intrusion into the wireless network.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NAM HUYNH whose telephone number is (571)272-5970. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m.-5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

NTH
5/20/08